(Copy.)

Leicester, July 8. 1857.

To the Editors of the Christian Register.

It was not till the middle of last week that I became aware of the personal attack you had made upon me, in the Register of the Saturday previous (June 28th). It was then too late for me to prepare a reply, that week, as time was necessary to procure from the gentleman who was my authority for the statement I had made about the Register his consent to the use of his name. You have charged me with speaking that which is "untrue" and with a purpose to "injure" and "malign" others. Permit me to occupy a little space in your columns, in reply to these charges.

For the statement which I made at Worcester and afterwards repeated at greater length in the Liberator of May 29th I had, first, the authority of the Rev. John Parkman, at that time an associate-editor with yourselves, and himself as he informed me, the writer of the article entitled "Slavery in Boston"; which was printed in a part of the edition of the Register of April 19th, and omitted from the remainder; and I had, second, the evidence of my own eyes and of the result of my inquiries. I saw a Register of April 19th 1851 sent to a friend in the country, containing an article conspicuously inserted, headed "Slavery in Boston," and referring in just but temperate terms to the case of the sending back of Thomas Sims from Boston into Slavery.

I saw also another Register of the same day and date, sent to a friend in Boston which contained no such article. No explanation appeared in the Register of this phenomenon. The Register of the next week came forth, but contained not a hint of the unusual character of the paper of the week previous. Meanwhile having inquired extensively I could not learn of a single copy of the Register sent to a subscriber in Boston, wh. contained the article on the Sims case. It is not pretended, I believe, that any one was so sent. For the other hand one of yourselves gentlemen (in the Commonwealth of May 17th) admits that that portion of the paper which did contain Mr. Parkman's article, was sent "to country and distant subscribers", and now, in the Register of June 28th it is added "to some of our subscribers in the country and to all our subscribers in the Southern or Slaveholding States".

With these admissions of your own gentlemen and with the known facts of the case, my statement at Worcester, and in Liberator of May 29. entirely agrees. I cannot discern upon re-examination, the slightest variation of the least importance.

But whilst thus charging me with untruth and malignity, what were you doing yourselves, Messrs. Editors, in your paper of June 28.? You copied an account of my remarks at Worcester, which account I had explicitly declared was erroneous in at least one important particular; and yet, though you had seen my correction of the error (in the Liberator of May 29. to which you make reference), and though I had made the correction also, in a conversation I held with Mr. Reed (publisher of the Register), you make no mention of it whatever but proceed to hold me answerable for a statement I never made. And then having shown for the satisfaction of the London Enquirer & its readers, that particular statement to be untrue, you charge me with untruth!

Where the untruthfulness exists, I am willing to leave it to any candid person to say. I said not a word at Worcester (as I explained in the Liberator of May 23) as to what copies of the Register were sent or were not sent to your Southern Subscribers. I knew nothing on that point and therefore I said nothing. I did say that the Register containing the Sims article was sent to your country subscribers for this I knew. And I did say that the Register, from which that article was stricken out, was sent to your city subscribers; for this also I knew.

As to these main facts — the striking out of the article and the sending of the former half to country and distant subscribers, the latter half to city subscribers you have yourselves admitted. I have never supposed that it was your Southern subscribers (who must be comparatively few in number) who were the most uneasy under the anti-slavery matter, from time to time appearing in the Register. Had I, at Worcester or any subsequent time, been asked whether the publication of the Sims article would occasion most dissatisfaction among your Southern subscribers, or among your Boston subscribers I should unhesitatingly have given it as my opinion that the Boston subscribers (or at least certain prominent and influential ones among them) would have resented it for the soonest, and most to the discomfort of all connected with the paper. It is well known that the Register has been of late severely handled in several of the political journals of Boston, for venturing to speak objectingly, or slightingly, of the proceedings in the Sims case.

Now, gentlemen, I call upon you to acquit me, before the same audience in whose hearing you made the charge, of disregard to the truth. Will you say I ought to have deemed Mr. Parkman's information insufficient, and gone to you, or anyone else, to learn if he had told me the truth? I maintain that throughout I proceeded with a due regard to caution, and that I stated the facts in the case carefully.

If my statement at Worcester was incorrect with regard to the agency of a certain "leading Hunkerish of Boston," (for I spoke of but one), in the removal of the article from the columns of the Register it was because and only because I was misinformed, though I have reason to believe that that information also was correct. I say no more on this point here for reasons of a private nature, not however in any manner concerning myself.

May I say a word or two about that expression in Rev. Daniel Foster's prayer, which was deemed by the publisher, and one of the editors, of the Register so objectionable? "Do thou destroy the wicked power that rules us". [The precise expression, as given by Mr. Parkman in his article is this, "In mercy, Heavenly Father do Thou, destroy the wicked power that rules us"] You say this would be understood to mean the destruction of our National Government. Why? do you mean to say that the National Government is so clearly a "wicked power" that "nine-tenths of your readers" would consider these words a description of it? Why not rather suppose, (as I see not how any one can in the least doubt) that Mr. Foster referred to the Slave Power which has so long ruled us, and so mercilessly. No matter what

phase of party politics happens to be uppermost for the time being? Pray tell us, gentlemen, is it an offence, is it wrong, to pray God "in mercy to destroy a wicked power"? With the prayers of prophets and apostles saints & martyrs and of Christ himself before you you cannot fairly object to that prayer. It seems to me to be looking our faith too severely to require us to believe that that expression in Daniel Foster's prayer was the only or chief cause of the rejection of Rev. John Parkman's article.

You intimate that an article, appearing in the Liberator, becomes unworthy of your notice! It is too late in the day for this kind of treatment of abolitionists. The Liberator is hated and feared by the upholders of slavery, and is a somewhat unpopular journal (in Boston particularly) it is true; but it does not deserve this sneer from you. A paper however, which has gone for years, and still goes, to the homes of many of the worthiest and most honoured Unitarians in America and in England, — ministers and lay men, — and is by them ~~prized~~ valued as few other papers are, may cheerfully abide your scorn, and await your better opinions.

You belong, gentlemen, I believe, to that School which often censured the abolitionists for their alleged bitterness and uncharitable language. Yet you speak of me as being a hundred times more earnest to injure the reputation and malign the character of my brethren than to learn the truth in a given case! Shall I now become a learner of you how to moderate my speech and deal charitably (not to say fairly) with others?

But with regard to these charges against me of a carelessness about the truth, and of malignity towards others, I pronounce them utterly without the shadow of support. I pretend to no infallibility; but I aver that I have been habitually scrupulous in my public words, refraining from statements about men and parties, until I had reliable evidence — their own words or deeds usually — against them. And my rule has always been to bring my statements clearly within what I have reason to believe the truth. The truth on this subject is terrible enough. It needs no exaggeration to give it force. — And as to the charge of malignity — since it rests wholly on your assertion, I might leave it where it is. I certainly will not retort it. But I believe there is not a living man who honours more truly than I do those of his brethren who have been true to their Unitarian and Christian faith and professions, — remembering their brother-man fallen among thieves, stripped, wounded, half-dead. There are no men, this day, whose society I more prize or whose writings I read with greater joy and thankfulness than theirs. But for those who say they will thrust a poor flying slave from their door, (and Christ in him, to my understanding), and for those who would be willing for any earthly or unearthly end, to give up their own flesh and blood to be slaves in the Southern land, — for them and their like I have no respect and cannot pretend to any. I have for them only astonishment, pity, aversion. I cannot prevent these feelings. I ask you, Gentlemen, may not all these exist without malignity? So far from cherishing the slightest personal ill-will towards one of these men, I sincerely lament their position, and wish them a safe deliverance from it, and a more consistent and more

happy labour than I believe their present one can be. But seeing their position as I do, I should be very guilty not to warn all, whom I could hope to influence, against being seduced by their counsels or misled by their example. I do not regard this as malignity. If you, gentlemen, do, I can only say, we differ.

Is this my offence, that I have called attention to a thing, which it was intended to keep quiet?

It will not perhaps render the circumstances, be deemed improper that I should add that Rev. John Parkman, in permitting that I should refer to him as my authority, says, "No one who knew you as well as I do would doubt either your determination to speak the truth or your conscientious desire to inform yourself thoroughly in respect to what you may propose to assert." It is also due to him, that I should say it is only for the main facts in this matter, and not for any inferences from those facts, that he is my authority. The facts on his and other authority, were established beyond gainsaying; the comments were my own, and did not purport to be otherwise.

To these lines (which I would gladly have made fewer, if I could) I ask you, gentlemen, to give an early place in the Register, as a matter of justice. But if you should refuse me this, please return the manuscript to me to me, to the care of R. F. Walcutt, 21 Cornhill, Boston.

I am, yours &c.

(Signed) Samuel May Jr

Mc. B.1.6 v.4, p.28